

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

Mark Kendrick,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 1:21-cv-00266

Warden Ronald T. Erdos, et al.,

Judge Michael R. Barrett

Defendants.

OPINION & ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's February 10, 2023 Report and Recommendation ("R&R"). (Doc. 65).

Proper notice has been given to the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), including notice that the parties would waive further appeal if they failed to file objections to the R&R in a timely manner. (Doc. 65 PageID 730); *see United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981). During the period to submit objections, Plaintiff filed a document titled "Motion to reinstate dismissed defendants under O.R.C 2921.45(B) for conspiring to deprive Plaintiff of civil rights by fraudulent use of the Exhaustion Requirement of the Prison Litigation Reform Act. Motion Request to Supplement complaint to add O.R.C 2921.45(B) allegations against dismissed Defendants and Defendants. Motion Request to present all evidence pertaining to Exhaustion and obstruction of it by dismissed defendant and evidence of retaliation by Unit manager Oppy for consideration to add as defendant." (Doc. 66). However, that that filing does not relate to the recommendation regarding Plaintiff's "Motion to Enforce court decree for Law Library Access." *Compare* (Doc. 65 PageID 725-29) (February 10, 2023 R&R), *with* (Doc. 66) (Plaintiff's February 23, 2023 Motion). Accordingly, no objections to the R&R

have been filed, and the time to so file has passed.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the R&R (Doc. 65) is **ADOPTED in full**, and Plaintiff's "Motion to Enforce court decree for Law Library Access" (Doc. 54) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s Michael R. Barrett _____
Michael R. Barrett, Judge
United States District Court